

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated February 21, 2007.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the (second) interface surface on the product item has (second) coded data indicative of a product identity and of a plurality of locations. Further, the second indicating data received by the computer system is indicative of the product identity and, for example, a position of the sensed coded data.

Basis for these amendments can be found at page 88, lines 1-4; page 88, lines 22-25; page 122, lines 5-34 *etc.*

Corresponding amendments have been made to method claim 12; claims 2 and 15 have been cancelled.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The Applicant contests the Examiner's assertion that the present invention is obvious in view of the combined disclosures of Gogulski, Chambers and Axelrod.

Claim 1 now specifies that the sensing device generates 'second indicating data' using the sensed second coded data (of the product item). The second indicating data is indicative of, for example, the position or orientation of the sensing device relative to the second interface surface.

None of the available prior art teaches a product scanner, which determines its relative position or orientation by sensing coded data on a product item. The Examiner makes reference to Axelrod in support of his assertion that positional determination of a scanner was known. However, Axelrod makes use of standard GPS technology to determine a geographical location of an ID card scanner. Axelrod does not yield a position of the scanner relative to a sensed interface surface. Moreover, Axelrod does not generate positional information *using sensed coded data*, as required by claim 1. Rather, Axelrod relies on satellite communication to yield geographical coordinate information.

Axelrod provides no suggestion to the skilled person to modify product items so that a scanner can determine both the product ID and a relative position/orientation of the scanner. In short, none of the prior art conceived of the Applicant's means for providing additional user interactivity with product items, combined with user ID determination via a single scanning device.

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of the combination of Gogulski, Chambers and Axelrod.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook



---

Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762